

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.**

SK



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
 United States Patent and Trademark Office  
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
 P.O. Box 1450  
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/369,490	08/05/1999	ERIC O. BODNAR	SF/0027.01	6852

22470 7590 08/25/2004  
 HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP  
 P O BOX 366  
 HALF MOON BAY, CA 94019

EXAMINER

ZIA, SYED

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2131

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SK

<b>Advisory Action</b>	Application No. 09/369,490	Applicant(s) BODNAR, ERIC O.	
	Examiner Syed Zia	Art Unit 2131	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 29 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☒ A Notice of Appeal was filed on 29 June 2004. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Attachment.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: -None-.

Claim(s) objected to: -None-.

Claim(s) rejected: 51-88.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: -None-.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Attachment to Advisory Action***

***Response to Amendment***

This office action is in response to the remarks filed after-final on June 29, 2004. Original application contained Claims 1-50. Applicant previously cancelled Claims 1-50. Applicant previously added Claims 51-78. Presently pending claims are 51-88.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed on June 29, 2004 have been fully considered. Applicant's arguments with respect to Claims 51-88 have been considered but they are not persuasive because of the following reasons:

Regarding Claims 51-76 applicants argued that the cited prior art (CPA) [Hoffman et al. U. S. Patent 6,122,657] does not teach, *"special key tags not defined in HTML but recognized by the parent process", 2) teaching of stateless text filtering", and 3)" the limitation of claims 60, and 62; modifying a system registry entry corresponding to the parent process, and publishing user-specific web page"*.

This is not found persuasive. CPA clearly teaches a system of context-sensitive web portal for Web client, where each Web client includes, interposed between its browser and communication layer, a Filter module (parent process) which traps and processes all communications between the browser and the communication layer. The Filter module, which implements client-side methodology at each individual Web client for dynamic filtering of hypertext tags and content, includes an output stream, a processing loop, a Filter method, and an

Art Unit: 2131

input stream. During system operation, the Web browser generates multiple requests for retrieving content. The command (request) is, however, trapped by the Filter module (parent process). The request or command is at this point processed by the parent process (Filter method of the Filter module). Accordingly, the system can modify the command, delete the command, synthesize new commands, or pass through unchanged the existing command. Thus in an exemplary embodiment of this invention, the parent process (Filter method) provides handlers for specific processing of various HTML (Hypertext Markup Language) tags, and operating according to user-configurable filtering preferences (system registry) stored in a (persistent) storage.

Therefore, CPA clearly teaches a method that involves receiving a user request at the browser for retrieval of the desired information from a particular server, based on the browser user-configurable settings indicating the particular processing of the tag-based command. The browser sends a fetch request to the particular server in response to the received user request, to retrieve the desired information (col. 5 line 22 to col.8 line 53).

As a result, CPA does implement and teaches a Web client/server system providing a method for embedding context sensitive Web portal into computer application, as broadly claimed by the applicant.

Applicants still clearly have failed to explicitly identify specific claim limitations, which would define a patentable distinction over prior arts.

Therefore, examiner asserts that CPA does teach or suggest the subject matter broadly recited in independent and dependent claims. Accordingly, rejections for claims 51-88 are respectfully maintained.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***


Regarding **Claim Rejection Based Upon 35 USC § 112** examiner still asserts that specification does not explicitly describe nor is sufficiently clear for one of ordinary skill in art to recognize the steps as recited in claims 51, 64, 79-81, and 85-87 (Please refer previous office action [Paper No. 5] for detail description).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Syed Zia whose telephone number is 703-305-3881. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 703-305-9648. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SZ  
August 16, 2004

  
AYAZ SHEIKH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100